

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING**

3 **Thursday, July 18, 2019**

4 **6:00 p.m.**

5 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Work Room**

6 **2277 East Bengal Boulevard**

7 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

8
9 **Members Present:** Chair Niels Valentiner, Scott Peters, Scott Chapman, Robyn Taylor-
10 Granda, Stephen Harman, Scott Henriksen, Jonathan Jay Oldroyd

11
12 **Staff Present:** Senior Planner Matthew Taylor, Associate Planner Andy Hulka, Deputy
13 Recorder Heather Sundquist

14
15 **BUSINESS MEETING**

16
17 **1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements**

18
19 Chair Niels Valentiner called the meeting to order at approximately 6:07 p.m.

20
21 **1.1 Ex Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**

22
23 There were no ex parte communications or conflicts of interest to disclose.

24
25 **2.0 Business Items**

26
27 **2.1 (Project SPL-19-009) Action on a Request from Travis Kozlowski for**
28 **Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for a Remodel of an Existing**
29 **Home at 8296 South Wasatch Boulevard.**

30
31 Associate City Planner, Andrew Hulka presented the staff report and stated that the request is for
32 the remodel of an existing home. The property is in the Gateway zone and any exterior
33 modifications require approval of the Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”). The proposal
34 was described. The intent was to remodel the home to be similar to the existing style in the area.
35 The applicants have applied for a building permit, which is currently under review by the Building
36 Department for technical compliance with City Code. Before the issue can be permitted, a
37 Certificate of Design Compliance must be issued by the Architectural Review Commission. Staff
38 recommended approval of the project without any additional conditions of approval.

39
40 A question was raised with respect to the exterior paint colors. They were described as white and
41 charcoal.

1 *Commissioner Chapman moved to accept Project SPL-19-009 for the remodel of an existing*
2 *home without conditions. Commissioner Oldroyd seconded the motion. The motion passed with*
3 *the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

4
5 **2.2 (Project SPL-19-007) Action on a Request by 1700 Fort Union Partners, LLC**
6 **for Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for 24 New Townhomes at**
7 **Approximately 1700 East Fort Union Boulevard.**

8
9 Senior Planner, Matt Taylor presented the staff report and stated that a number of design criteria
10 were discussed and modifications were made to the design of the proposed project. The changes
11 made since the last review were identified as well as design considerations that had not yet been
12 resolved.

13
14 Parking issues were discussed. It was reported that there are 12 parking stalls. Mr. Taylor stated
15 that the applicants reduced the parking by two spaces since the last meeting where they were over
16 by two. The property is located on 1700 East and Fort Union Boulevard and there are three existing
17 homes on the site. The two on the east have been zoned mixed use for a few years. The properties
18 to the west were rezoned mixed-use a few months earlier. The property is in the Fort Union
19 Boulevard Master Plan, which calls for redevelopment. It is also bordered closely by R-1-8.

20
21 The parcels are currently zoned mixed-use and will be combined into one parcel. There is no
22 specific density limit as it is defined by the setbacks and building height. The applicants have
23 proposed to meet their mixed-use criteria by having live-work units. With regard to parking, the
24 applicant stated that they are proposing 2.25 spaces per unit with an additional requirement for the
25 commercial element. Parking options were described. It was noted that there is markings along
26 Main Street and on Kensington. No parking is allowed on 1700 East or Fort Union Boulevard. A
27 Commission Member commented that the parking seemed “tight”.

28
29 A traffic study was performed to address the parking concerns associated with the site. It was
30 noted that in most cases, the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (“ITE”) manual, parking
31 standards are referred to. They recommend 1.5 spaces per unit. The applicants thought that was
32 too low for a townhome project and proposed two spaces per unit in addition to three spaces per
33 1,000 square feet of commercial area. With regard to tandem spaces, Mr. Taylor stated that there
34 is nothing specific in the Code prohibiting them but there were concerns. One of the challenges
35 the City faces in denying tandem spaces is that State law specifies that when there is ambiguity in
36 the Code, deference needs to be given to the applicant.

37
38 Another challenge the City faces is imposing more parking because the use is permitted in the MU
39 zone. Home occupations are also allowed with retail and small office. Any combination of those
40 uses qualifies in a mixed-use residential building. With regard to conditional uses, if a detriment
41 is identified, conditions can be imposed to mitigate the negative impact.

42
43 Mr. Taylor stated that the applicants are also asking for exceptions that the Planning Commission
44 will have to consider such as front and side yard setbacks. It was noted that the Fort Union Master
45 Plan calls for redevelopment of the corridor. One of the points of discussion from the last meeting
46 was the solid wall of buildings being proposed. The request will eventually be reviewed by the

1 Planning Commission who will approve the height and setbacks. They will also address site plan
2 approval. With respect to design compliance, the proposal should be compared to the Design
3 Guidelines to ensure consistency. At the last meeting, it was estimated that 20 different standards
4 were addressed and the developer either agreed to make changes or it was deemed appropriate.
5 What remains to be discussed tonight are the remaining outstanding issues.

6
7 Mr. Taylor reported that the Fort Union Corridor Master Plan was approved as City policy a few
8 years ago and established a community district that includes this area. It called for redevelopment
9 within the corridor into more mixed-use development. The proposal seemed to be consistent with
10 that plan. The plan also calls for the redevelopment of Fort Union Boulevard. The Code requires
11 an additional six feet of right-of-way as well to help meet the standards.

12
13 The previous site plan was displayed and had not changed substantially. The proposed changes
14 were identified. The applicant stated that they added more clarity to the landscape plans and low
15 front yard fencing along each of the units. Mr. Taylor identified outstanding issues and how each
16 was addressed. They include articulation of the buildings and creating a courtyard or internally
17 breaking up the main building. He also asked for feedback on the signage.

18
19 The applicant described the proposed changes and stated that with respect to breaking up the
20 buildings, on the new design they changed the façade. They were in compliance in terms of the
21 setbacks and other requirements of the Mixed-Use zone. They provided 20 feet along the project
22 but deeded right-of-way to the City to allow for future redevelopment. Landscaping was added to
23 accommodate the proposed 3.5-foot fences in front of each unit. They also redesigned the
24 walkways and made a more clear design for what will be behind the rear units.

25
26 Retaining walls and landscaping details were discussed. The applicant felt that the proposal
27 complies with the architectural guidelines. A Commission Member commented that it is a good
28 project but oversized. Concerns identified included setbacks, parking, and access. An exception
29 was requested along the front of the property due to the Fort Union Master Plan. The applicant
30 confirmed that they are fulfilling the setback requirement along the west and south border.
31 Features of the site were described.

32
33 A Commission Member pointed out that the applicants are seeking an exception because they are
34 pushing the buildings as far out as possible to accommodate an additional unit. If they were to
35 eliminate the extra unit, space would be created to break up the façade. In addition, because of the
36 power lines, they cannot plant trees. The result is to place a row of shrubs along the front and there
37 is no added design to the landscaped area. If trees and additional landscaping are not put in, they
38 should do something with the hardscaping and plantings to create something other than a sidewalk
39 along the front of the lots.

40
41 Commissioner Taylor-Granda suggested that the sidewalk be broken out where there is one access
42 on the street level. There should be articulation and definition of each area rather than just at the
43 center. She pointed out that there is very little daylight between the buildings. She reminded the
44 applicant that this is Cottonwood Heights and certain things are desired here. The master plan
45 does not intend for an entire block to be covered completely by one building. She commented that
46 the applicant has completely occupied four lots with one building. She considered that to be

1 inappropriate density for the surrounding area. The applicant stated that they designed the project
2 according to the Code. Commissioner Taylor-Granda reminded him that pursuing the highest
3 density is not required and they have consciously chosen to pursue that.

4
5 It was noted that the City has made a decision to increase density along Fort Union Boulevard. A
6 Commission Member pointed out, however, that if they go with a denser project, it should be done
7 appropriately. He was concerned when exceptions are sought that require even more density on a
8 site. If an exception is requested, it is the job of the Commission to recommend what they consider
9 to be the highest design quality in exchange for that exception.

10
11 It was suggested that one of the conditions of approval be that the mass of the building be broken
12 up. Possible options were discussed. Commissioner Taylor-Granda commented that the massing
13 and scale of the proposed building is not congruent with anything around it. The building should
14 include features that articulate the building massing and scale relative to surrounding sites. In this
15 case, there is nothing that interfaces with anything around it.

16
17 A Commission Member argued that the intent is to transform Fort Union Boulevard. It was his
18 opinion that the development needs to be more dense but more variety is needed in the building.
19 There also is very little pedestrian space on the site. In the absence of trees, planters or other
20 landscaping should be provided to add interest.

21
22 Robyn Taylor-Granda thought that as much energy should be put into this project as every other
23 and be consistent. The project will have a huge impact on the community and as proposed, sets a
24 precedent that is not desirable. She argued that the execution and not the design, is in question.

25
26 The applicant asked for possible suggestions short of eliminating units to help break up the
27 building. A Commission Member commented that it is not the job of the Commission to design
28 the building but he would like them to follow the guidelines.

29
30 Commissioner Taylor-Granda commented that two sections are not done to scale. The applicant
31 stated that one option could be to place accent units every 15 feet. Another option was to do
32 something more dramatic with two or three of the units to break them up. The applicants wanted
33 to make the site work and pursue something that can be supported by the Commission. Stacking
34 of the units was suggested as well as installing skylights to add interest.

35
36 Commissioner Taylor-Granda stated that what is proposed is larger than recent business
37 developments that the Commission has reviewed. In those cases, the Commission was careful to
38 ensure that all sides were articulated. She did not feel that what the applicants were asked to do
39 was unreasonable. She suggested that there be concern and care taken to address the other view
40 on Fort Union Boulevard.

41
42 Chair Valentiner commented that the determination of the Commission is whether they feel that
43 the buildings are designed appropriately.

44
45 A Commission Member remarked that this is not a traditional building and is a style. He stated
46 that perhaps the Commission needs to better understand how the two facades come together.

1 Procedural and timing issues were discussed. Mr. Taylor indicated that the developer is anxious
2 to move onto the Planning Commission at their August 7 meeting.

3
4 ***Commissioner Peters moved to continue the request from 1700 Fort Union Partners, LLC***
5 ***subject to the following:***

6
7 ***1. The applicants shall deal with the breaking up of the façade in a manner that is strong***
8 ***and that adds to the project. The Commission will look at quality in determining whether***
9 ***to grant an exception for the setbacks.***

10
11 ***2. The applicants shall look at and consider the site elevations of the buildings.***

12
13 ***3. The applicants shall look at the landscaping, particularly on the north side, and how it***
14 ***relates to the street and design it to have visual interest, specifically given the fact that***
15 ***they cannot plant trees due to the power lines.***

16
17 ***Commissioner Chapman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent***
18 ***of the Commission.***

19
20 **3.0 CONSENT AGENDA**

21
22 **3.1 Approval of Minutes for July 18, 2019.**

23
24 Mr. Taylor suggested a change to the procedure for approving the minutes and specify that they
25 will not be approved until they are received and reviewed by the Commission prior to the next
26 meeting.

27
28 **4.0 ADJOURNMENT**

29
30 ***Commissioner Peters moved to adjourn. Commissioner Valentiner seconded the motion. The***
31 ***motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

32
33 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:47 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights Architectural Review Commission Meeting held Thursday, July 18, 2019.*

3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: September 25, 2019